

Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 2nd dbase submittal
From: Edward Henning
Date: 10/12/2016 11:20 AM
To: Dennis Rader
CC: Lorena at San Pedro BID <lparker@sanpedrobid.com>

Hi Dennis - thanks so much for the feedback - I will check out each of these questions/issues and get back to you soon.

Yes, the Harbor/Port Dept did provide the building areas for their parcels included in the "expansion "area". I have no other way to verify these numbers.

On some of those jointly owned LA/Long Beach ex-RR parcels, there appears to be inconsistent application of the "exempt ROW" provision used in the past in this BID (before my involvement). I tried to sort it out and at least have consistency on both owners of such parcels - either both exempt or both assessed. I'll review the one(s) you mentioned again for inclusion/exclusion/consistency. My take on any parcel ultimately declared "exempt" would be to include but not assess. My understanding is that the SP BID Association would like to have the freedom to hold special events in these geographic areas that may or may not involve these parcels.

Also, on mixed zoning parcels that have portions that would be exempt by State Law (i.e. R 1-3 or Ag), my understanding is that we would prefer to exempt the whole APN rather than get into a meandering fragmented assessed/not assessed situation (like we've had in some BIDs in the Valley which are much cleaner and well defined lines).

I'll respond to these other questions as soon as I can.

Thanks again.

Ed Henning, Principal Consultant
Edward Henning & Associates
760-868-9963

-----Original Message-----

From: Dennis Rader
Sent: Oct 12, 2016 10:57 AM
To: Edward Henning
Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 2nd dbase submittal

Hi Ed, I have finished my first review of the San Pedro data and I had some questions and/or data revisions (not that many).

- 1) What was the source of the building sqft on Harbor Dept expansion-area parcels? I know that in the past the Harbor Dept itself would weigh in on what sqft we were to use.
- 2) What happened to LA/LB City parcels 7440-034-906 & 907, labeled on the assr map as abandoned railroad, are they exempt? Are you meaning to include exempt parcels that are within the boundary at zero assessment, or exclude them altogether from the list?
- 3) 7440-035-904: this is 22nd Street Park, there don't appear to be any structures on this parcel, but you have 25,000. There are two warehouses on adjacent parcel 7440-034-901, but not on this parcel.
- 4) Parcel 7440-036-904 isn't listed, and it looks to have many scattered structures on it. I don't know if you included the structures on a different parcel?
- 5) You listed 7440-039-911 & 7440-040-907 as partially AG1 zoned and exempt from assessment. These two parcels actually have partially R4 & M2 zoning associated with them which are assessable zoning types. Parcels that have only partially exempt zoning are actually completely assessable. I noticed that there are some buildings on these parcels, did you still want to exempt them?
- 6) 7455-002-028: parcel area calculates to exactly 14,450. I'd use this value.
- 7) 7455-004-005: County records show 10,224 building sqft, and google street view shows possible partial second floor. I'd use County value of 10,224.
- 8) 7455-005-903: this is part of a large parking lot, remove building sqft.
- 9) 7455-006-001: building area: this is ground floor commercial 8,420 sqft and two residential floors above at 11,400 sqft for a total of 19,820 sqft.
- 10) 7455-013-904: this is part of a large parking lot, remove building sqft.
- 11) 7455-025-900: the parcel area of this median is $80 \times 955 = 76,400$ (not 54,671).

Please let me know if you have any questions/responses to the above, thanks Ed.

On Thu, Sep 22, 2016 at 3:46 PM, Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net> wrote:

Hi Dennis - here is 2nd draft of the San Pedro BID dbase. Based on your Sep 15 email - here are some explanatory notes:

1. I embedded some clarification notes in the spreadsheet for the first 50 or so parcels for public and private parcel examples you cited in

your Sep 15 email

2. Beyond that point I generally selected NBS's 2016 land area data since that was the info I was given for this renewal project and there appears to be a fair amount of questionable data from both the City approved 2012 land area data as the info obtained by NBS. The main exception is for all the condo land areas which were not pro-rated by NBS - only bulk land data was provided. I've pro-rated each condo land figure based on the # of units in each complex.
3. Note: Zone 2 parcels are assessed only for building area (if any) - not land area.
4. Figures altered since the last submittal are highlighted in yellow.
5. Please note that blank cells in either the 2012 land area or 2012 building area columns generally means that NBS's 2016 data was the same as the City approved 2012 data for unchanged parcels.
6. Please use the first spreadsheet tab labeled "All parcels merged". I'm not certain that all other tab data was changed to match the suggested tab. I will sync each tab at a later time.

Please let me know as you go along if any questions or major issues. Thank you again for your time and great efforts on each of these BIDs.

Ed Henning, Principal Consultant
Edward Henning & Associates
[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

-----Original Message-----

From: Edward Henning
Sent: Sep 21, 2016 4:32 PM
To: Dennis Rader
Cc: Lorena at San Pedro BID
Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 1st dbase submittal

Hi Dennis - I haven't forgotten about you and the San Pedro dbase - it's just that upon further review, there were additional land area data glitches that I found that may have started in 2007, carried over to 2012 and are now re-surfacing with your current review. That simple 45 x 100 rectangle parcel example you pointed out that should be 4500 sq ft (my response to you last week incorrectly says 7500 sq ft but should have said 4500 sq ft - sorry) - well some of these parcel areas were off by a few feet back in 2012 and now in 2016 show correctly by NBS (LA County data source) but others were correct in 2012 and are off in 2016.

I wanted to just choose either using the 2012 data for all unchanged parcels or the new 2016 data but it appears that there are overt errors in both sets of data (assuming that the APN maps are accurate and the lot dimensions are actually whole numbers, like 45 x 100. If it's actually 45.1 x 100, this would produce an area of 4510, or 10 sq ft off from what we think is 4500 sq ft even. I don't have a simple solution other than to show you both sets of data (City approved 2012 data and the current NBS provided 2016 data) and have you choose the correct one or even a new correct figure based on your source(s).

There are also a few other 1/2 undivided interest parcels (LA/Long Beach) and it appears that the assessment methodology was inconsistently applied to these oddball parcels back in 2012 where the whole parcel area was assessed and levied on City of Long Beach with the City of LA getting a pass. Not sure if these were negotiated arrangements or just arbitrarily applied assessments. I will highlight my data cell questions on the resubmitted excel file.

I will re-submit the dbase soon once I've corrected some of the obvious errors as you pointed out in your email.

Thanks for your help and patience on this one Dennis. FYI I'll also be submitting the merged 2000 parcel South Park I & II BID dbase probably the first of next week which is a real doozy with all the bizarre commercial condos around the LA Live and Staples Center.

Ed Henning, Principal Consultant
Edward Henning & Associates
[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

-----Original Message-----

From: Edward Henning
Sent: Sep 16, 2016 1:11 PM
To: Dennis Rader
Cc: Lorena at San Pedro BID
Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 1st dbase submittal

Hi Dennis - thanks for your initial review and feedback on the 1st draft of the San Pedro BID dbase. As I mentioned earlier, I was handed an "updated" dbase prepared by NBS for this BID and there were numerous glitches in the parcel data, some of which I corrected or filled in when missing and others which I appear to have compounded for some unexplained reason.

The main issue, as you pointed out, is that the land data is off by a few feet almost across the board on even simple rectangle parcels with square corners. I encounter this all the time with my online data source (Parcel Quest) and with 3rd party providers like NBS and Wildan. They all insist that they derive their parcel data directly from LA County tapes which as you pointed out, these errors defy simple logic. Attached is a screen grab of the sample parcel you mentioned from my source, Parcel Quest, that also shows the "4,499" sq ft figure for this parcel that is obviously 7,500 sq ft (45' x 100'). If I visited a County Assessor office and used their in house computer terminal, it would show the correct 7,500 sq ft figure but each parcel has to be individually called up on the screen for review. This is the main reason I left a column in my dbase showing the 2012 data since I figured these numbers were already reviewed and approved by your Division, but I didn't just want to ignore all the data paid for and provided by NBS for the SP BID.

I've discussed this problem with Garen in the past and our only guess is that there is a separate phantom set of parcel land area data issued by the County that was generated from a scribed method that measures an area from a physically drawn map and the line thickness used on the map causes this repeat random error. I only offer this explanation because I observed it first hand a while back as a GIS tech person in some City was scribing lot dimensions and the enclosed lot area from a printed map using a scribing pen and the oddball results were similar. This same problem doesn't seem to apply to building area data except where the County has updated info based on physical changes to building sizes or new field measurements.

As far as APN Book/Block 7440-030 - yes, upon further review, the land data for that whole block is messed up - some with bad info from NBS and others with erroneous figures that I entered (possibly messed up with a re-sorting or a cut and paste error). I will re-do the land data for this whole block and re-check the other surrounding complex government owned blocks and re-submit the whole doc to you by Monday.

Regarding the first issue discussed above, if you see that most of the land area data from 2012 is still valid perhaps use an "OK" notation in your inserted "comments column and we will just use the 2012 figures, where applicable.

Thanks again Dennis for your continued diligence and assistance with these BIDs and sorry for the myriad of data issue that complicate your reviews.

Talk soon. take care.

Ed Henning, Principal Consultant
Edward Henning & Associates
[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

-----Original Message-----

From: Dennis Rader
Sent: Sep 15, 2016 9:28 AM
To: Edward Henning
Cc: Lorena at San Pedro BID
Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 1st dbase submittal

Hi Ed, I've just started looking at the San Pedro data and I already have some questions regarding the land area that I've initially noticed. I'm not sure where the final numbers are coming from? For example:

Parcels 7440030911 & 919 share an undivided 1/2 interest in a 23,000 sqft parcel of land (from assr map), which would equal 11,500 each. This was the number used for the last renewal. But in your spreadsheet, the corresponding LA values are 113,325 and 54,671. Where did those numbers come from?

Another example: so many of the parcels in zone 1A differ in land area by small values from the proposed data to the current, for example 7454003023. When the assr map shows 45x100 why would your value be 4499 vs. 4500?

Let know about these so I know how to proceed with the data review, thanks.

On Mon, Aug 1, 2016 at 12:53 AM, Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net> wrote:

Hi Dennis - I'm assisting San Pedro BID with their next renewal which expires June 30, 2017 (property tax year). Attached is an excel "dbase" of all parcels within the San Pedro BID including a proposed 14 large parcel expansion (mainly Port of LA) to the south along the waterfront. The raw data was provided to us by NBS but I've made many adjustments for missing data (mainly government parcels) either from 2012 renewal data or from the Port of LA themselves on all expansion parcels. Also attached is the list of proposed Yr 1 assessment rates within 3 zones (1A, 1B and 2). We may end up calling these simply Zone 1,2 and 3 but it's still being considered. Condo complexes (both residential and commercial) and assessed based on their building area plus their proportionate land area based on the total number of combined condo units divided into the parcel land area. Street frontage is not an assessment factor in this BID. I'll be working on getting the MDP and ER submitted in the next 15-30 days.


Also attached is a rough boundary map which includes the proposed expansion but doesn't yet show the Benefit Zones nor APNs or parcel IDs. We'll get this to you soon.

Please don't hesitate to contact me when/as questions arise.

Thanks again for your help on this project.

Ed Henning, Principal Consultant
Edward Henning & Associates
[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division
[213-978-1120](tel:213-978-1120)



Ed Henning, Principal Consultant
Edward Henning & Associates
[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

--
Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division
213-978-1120